

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 15-18 and 22-45 are active.

Claims 15, 16 and 18 have been amended to incorporate Claims 1, 9 and 12.

Claims 22-45 find support in Claims 2-7 and 10-11 as well as the specification as originally filed.

The rejections of Claims 1, 5-7 and 9-10 under 35 USC 102(b); of Claims 2-4 and 8 under 35 USC 102(b) or 35 USC 103(a); and Claim 11 under 35 USC 103(a) citing Forker is not applicable to the claims presented in this paper as the rejected claims are cancelled.

Similarly, the rejections of Claim 13 under 35 USC 103(a) citing Forker and Meyer and of Claims 19-21 under 35 USC 103(a) citing Forker and Wilhoite are not applicable as Claims 13 and 19-21 are cancelled.

Thus, what remains is the obviousness rejection combining Forker and Craver to reject Claims 12, and 14-18. The rejection acknowledges that Forker does not specify a use of the glass pane he describes, such as a door with a pane. However, as Craver teaches that doors can be made of strengthened glass and Forker teaches strengthened glass, one would have been motivated to employ Forker's glass in the types of applications that Craver suggests (see pages 5-6 of the Official Action).

Applicants respectfully disagree that the pending claims would have been obvious because one would not have used Forker's glass in Craver as alleged in the rejection because Forker's glass is not a conventional glass as called for by Craver but one rather specially designed for automotive applications. In addition, the present application demonstrates improved performance of the claimed strengthened glass compared to the types of

U.S. application serial no. 10/577,559  
Reply to Official Action of August 24, 2009

conventional glass that Craver teaches. Further details on both of these points are provided in the comments that follow.

Forker's invention relates to improvements in the manufacturing of automotive glass (see col. 1, line 62 to col. 2, line 4). While it is true that Craver in col. 5, suggests that "conventional tempered or silica sand glass" is useful to incorporate into his particularized firebox door assembly, the inclusion of tempered glass in Craver is not sufficient motivation to look to automotive glass as in Forker. More specifically, Forker's is not a conventional tempered or silica sand glass because Forker's glass contains a high amount of alumina, and is a soda-alumina-silica glass (see col. 5 line 35). A conventional tempered glass is a soda-lime glass typically including less than 1% alumina, which is not to be confused with Forker's (see attached print out of <http://www.glassonweb.com/articles/article/41/> and <http://glassproperties.com/glasses/>).

Therefore, there simply is no reason that one would have, reading Craver, reached into Forker for teachings relevant to "conventional tempered or silica sand glass" that Craver suggests. At least on this basis, the rejection cannot be sustained.

Further, the present application presents comparative data (starting at page 7) compare three different glasses whereby the glass when chemically treated for an extended period of time and which has unique strain point and interdiffusion coefficients performed significantly better in the tests provided in Examples 1 and 2 (pages 9-10 of the application) when compared to a conventional strengthened glass ("Planilux"), see Table 1. This conventional Planilux glass is the type of soda-lime glass that Craver suggests and the strain point of a soda-lime glass is 514°C (see attached print out from <http://www.valleydesign.com/sodalime.htm>) comparable to the strain point of the Planilux glass and well under the lower limit of strain point defined in the present claims (at least 550°C).

U.S. application serial no. 10/577,559  
Reply to Official Action of August 24, 2009

As is shown by the data in the application, the conventional soda-lime glass, of the type suggested by Craver glass performed poorly when compared to the particular strengthened glass as defined in the present claims shown in the results of table 3 (see line "CS77" compared to Planylux).

In view of the above discussion, the attached evidence, the amended claims and consideration of the evidence presented in the specification, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

A Notice of Allowance for all pending claims is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

Daniel J. Pereira  
Registration No. 45,518

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)